

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/837,541 | 04/19/2001 | Jason Tribbeck | 550-226 | 7581 |
| 7590 08/24/2004 | | | EXAMINER | |
| NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C. 8th Floor 1100 North Glebe Road Arlington, VA 22201-4714 | | | HUYNH, CONG LAC T | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2178 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/837,541 | Applicant(s) TRIBBECK, JASON | |
| | Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh | Art Unit 2178 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/19/01</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the application and IDSs filed on 4/19/01, priority 5/7/99.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 15 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to because of the following typographical errors:
 - the "computers 6.8." (page 5, lines 27-28)
 - the "category data 38" and "category data 18" (page 7, lines 15, 17)
 - the "Figure 7" (page 10, line 10); it should be Figure 9 since figure 7 does not have the left hand portion showing a senses of hypertext links with all of the graphical data from the source page removed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2178

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0032699 A1, 3/14/02, filed 6/17/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Edwards discloses:

- detecting initial display text associated with said link data item for display on a display device to at least partially represent said link data item to a user when said document is displayed (**figure 6**: *open HTML file, read the file from '<a' up to '', take text between quotes as page reference, and note the text for coloured labels* indicates that the elements between '<a' and '' comprising a link data item and the display text associated with said link item is detected)
- upon detection of said one or more characteristics indicative of said initial display text being insufficiently readable by said user, then replacing some or all of said initial display text with further text selected in dependence upon said link data item to provide a modified display text for display on said display device (**figure 8, [0130]-[0134]**: the fact that the link text is greater than the screen width indicates that the whole link text can not be displayed on the screen thus the link text is insufficiently readable to a user; replacing the text link with the text link after being reduced until being fitted in the screen shows that the initial display text is replaced with a modified display text on the display device)

Art Unit: 2178

Edwards does not explicitly disclose applying one or more predetermined rules to said initial display text to detect one or more characteristics indicative of said initial display text being insufficiently readable by said user.

However, Edwards does teach shortening each link to 30 characters, removing unnecessary words in the link, and shortening "AND" and "OR" to "&" and "/" to reduce the length of the link (figure 7, [0130]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Edwards to include applying one or more predetermined rules to said initial display text to detect one or more characteristics indicative of said initial display text being insufficiently readable by said user for the following reason.

The fact that Edwards discloses shorten each link to 30 characters suggests applying the rule of that limited number of characters to be displayed on the screen. If the number of characters is greater than that, the link text becomes insufficiently readable to a user since a part of the link text can not be viewable on the screen.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Edwards does not explicitly disclose that the further text includes one or more of:

- a document title for said linked location identified by said link data item
- text selected from a dictionary in dependence upon keywords identified within said link data item
- a word produced by truncating a computer file name including a computer file type extension by removing said computer file type extension

- text selected in dependence upon category data associated with said link data item

Instead, Edwards discloses removing unnecessary words in the link description to shorten the link length ([0130], [0134]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Edwards to incorporate text selected in dependence upon keywords identified within said link data item for the following reason. The fact that Edwards discloses removing unnecessary words in the link description to shorten the link length suggests that the link, after the unnecessary words being removed, be left with meaningful words. This further suggests that the meaningful words may include keywords in the link text. In other words, the replaced text, which is the text left after removing unnecessary words, includes keywords in the link text wherein it was obvious that these keywords are in a dictionary.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Edwards discloses that said further text replaces said initial display text to form said modified display text (**figure 8, [0130]-[0134]**: the link text after being shortened shows that said text is modified to replace the original text).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Edwards discloses:

- applying one or more predetermined rules to said modified display text to detect one or more characteristics indicative of said modified display text being

insufficiently readable by said user (**figure 8, [0133], [0134]**: continuing checking if the link labels are *wider than the screen* after the modification has been made on the link labels and shortening the link labels until the labels fit the screen width; thus, checking if the text is wider than the screen width is considered as one of the rules to detect whether the modified link text is readable to a user)

Edwards does not disclose that upon detection of said one or more characteristics indicative of said modified text being insufficiently readable by said user, then reverting to said initial display text.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Edwards to include reverting to said initial display text for the following reason. The fact that Edwards has the ability to shorten the text to a given length set by the screen width and it was well known in word processing to retrieve the previous form of a text after being modified upon a user's desire suggests to revert to the initial display text if the text is insufficient readable by said user.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Edwards discloses that one or more of predetermined rules includes one or more of:

- the number of underscore characters within said initial display text is greater than the number of space characters within said initial display text
- the initial display text is less than a minimum threshold number of characters in length

Art Unit: 2178

- the initial display text is greater than a maximum threshold number of characters in length (**figure 7, #740**: 30 is the maximum threshold number of characters in length for the initial display text, thus, the link text is shortened to 30 characters if the display text is greater than that number of characters)
- the average number of characters per word in said initial display text is greater than a maximum threshold average word length
- the initial display text contains words that include capital letters after lower case letters
- the initial display text contains words not found in an associated dictionary of words

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Edwards discloses that said data file is retrieved from a source computer server via a computer network ([0027]).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, Edwards discloses that the steps of detecting, applying and replacing are performed by a client computer which requests said data file from said source computer server ([0027], [0124]-[0134]).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Edwards discloses that said client computer has a user display with different display capabilities than those of a display for which said document is intended or said document is display independent ([0018], [0029]).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Edwards discloses that said client computer is a wireless mobile device ([0018], [0185], [0190]).

Claims 11-12, 14 are for an apparatus of method claims 1 and 6, 8 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 15 is for a computer program storage medium of method claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards as applied to claims 6 and 12 above, and further in view of Narayanaswami (US Pat No. 6,672,775 B1, 1/6/04, filed 8/1/97).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Edwards does not explicitly disclose that the steps of detecting, applying, and replacing are performed by a proxy server disposed within said computer network between said source computer server and a client computer requesting said data file.

Narayanaswami discloses the proxy server for rendering a web page requested by a client without requiring outside access to the Internet if the request is repeated and the rendered web page is already stored at the proxy server (col 2, lines 20-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Narayanaswami into Edwards to incorporate a proxy

Art Unit: 2178

server for performing the steps of detecting, applying, and replacing at the proxy instead of performing these steps at a server for the following reason. Narayanaswami teaches a proxy server for performing the action for rendering a requested web page thus motivating to incorporate into Edwards the proxy server for performing the steps of detecting, applying, and replacing for a higher speed process since for the repeated requests, the requested documents are retrieved from the proxy cache, which is closer to the client than the remote server.

Claim 13 is for an apparatus of method claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mercer (US Pat No. 6,547,830 B1, 4/15/03, filed 8/13/99).

Turney (US Pat No. 6,470,307 B1, 10/22/02, filed 6/23/97).

Herrod et al. (US Pat No. 6,405,049 B2, 6/11/02, filed 8/5/97).

Rodkin et al. (US Pat No. 6,092,074, 7/18/00, filed 2/10/98).

Karttunen (US Pat No. 6,023,760, 2/8/00, filed 5/16/97).

Simons et al. (US Pat No. 6,320,595 B1, 11/20/01, filed 1/19/99).

Spitznagel et al. (US Pat No. 6,081,815, 6/27/00, filed 10/6/97).

Dahl. (US Pat No. 5,801,691, 9/1/98, filed 12/31/96).

Lynn, Personal Organiser, Sunday Herald, Glasgow (UK) Mar 14, 1999, pages 4,

ProQuest Database.

Art Unit: 2178

Han et al., Dynamic Adaptation in An Image Transcoding Proxy Mobile Web Browsing, IEEE December 1998, pages 8-17.

Henderson et al., Rooms : The Use of Multiple Virtual Workspaces to Reduce Space Contention in a Window-Based Graphical User Interface, ACM Transaction on Graphics 1987, pages 211-243.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 703-308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
8/20/04